REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 20, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 were pending in this application prior to the office action. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are amended, and claim 12 is newly added. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 have been amended to clarify the invention, and not for reasons of patentability. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 12 are currently pending in this application.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ueda et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0003601 A1) (*Ueda*, hereinafter). Applicant traverses this rejection as follows.

The present independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, are patently distinguishable over *Ueda*, since *Ueda*, either taken alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the features recited in pending independent claim 1. For example, independent claim 1 (emphasis added) recites:

> A manufacturing method of a display device in a plasma treatment chamber comprising the step of:
>
> forming a wiring by partially etching a conductor film over a substrate by **discharging a plasma to the plasma treatment chamber from a plasma treatment means** having one set of electrodes contained therein for generating the plasma at a pressure of 5 to 800 Torr from **a reactive gas introduced to the plasma treatment means,**
>
> **wherein the plasma treatment means is provided in the plasma treatment chamber**.

Thus, independent claim 1 is directed to, *inter alia*, the feature of discharging a plasma to the plasma treatment chamber from a plasma treatment means having one set of electrodes contained therein for generating the plasma at a pressure of 5 to 800 Torr from a reactive gas introduced to the plasma treatment means, wherein the plasma treatment means is provided in the plasma treatment chamber.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Ueda* either taken alone or in combination. Specifically, *Ueda* does not disclose discharging a plasma to the plasma treatment chamber from a plasma treatment means having one set of electrodes contained therein for generating the plasma at a pressure of 5 to 800 Torr from a reactive gas introduced to the plasma treatment means, wherein the plasma treatment means is provided in the plasma treatment chamber, as recited in independent claim 1.

In fact, *Ueda* merely discloses a conventional plasma process, well known within the art. *Ueda* illustrates this conventional method in Fig. 7 and the accompanying description in the specification, i.e., paragraph [0090] (emphasis added), which recites:

> **[0090]** Chamber **100** carries out the dry etching process on the transparent electrode on the substrate S in a vacuum. Within chamber **100** a vacuum state is maintained by pump P via valve V. The dry etched substrate S is held in a conductive, grounded holder **109**, which is linked to an elevator mechanism **E1**. Elevator mechanism **E1** is constructed so as to be vertically moveable in one direction and an opposite direction within the chamber. A metal mask **110** used for dry etching is positioned selectively inside or outside the vertical travel path of the elevator E1. Plasma is generated for the dry etching; [*sic*] This plasma is generated by the action of an electric field of high energy produced when plasma gas is introduced within the chamber **100** within which a vacuum is maintained. The plasma gas is supplied from gas cylinder via valve V. The electric field is obtained by supplying a high frequency or low frequency voltage from power source **V1** between holder **109** and a discharge electrode **300** disposed opposite at a predetermined spacing.

Thus as seen in the above emphasized portion of paragraph [0090] in *Ueda*, the plasma gas (i.e., the reaction gas) is supplied directly into the dry etching chamber 100 (i.e., the plasma treatment chamber), and not a plasma treatment means, as in the present invention.

Therefore, since the plasma gas of *Ueda* must first enter the dry etching chamber 100 before the plasma can be generated by the application a high power electric field between electrode 300 and ground holder 109 (see *Ueda*, e.g., paragraph [0090]), it follows that the plasma of *Ueda* cannot be discharged to the plasma treatment chamber from the plasma treatment means having one set of electrodes contained therein for generating the plasma from a reactive gas introduced to the plasma treatment means, as substantially recited in independent claim 1.

Conversely, in the method steps of the present invention, the reactive gas is introduced to the plasma treatment means, wherein the plasma treatment means has a set of electrodes for generating a plasma from the reactive gas, and the plasma is discharged to the plasma treatment chamber from the plasma treatment means.

For the reasons stated above, *Ueda* is deficient at least for failing to disclose, teach or suggested all the claimed features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious over, the disclosure of *Ueda*. Thus, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ueda* in view of Miyata (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0002331 A1) (*Miyata*, hereinafter). Applicant traverses this rejection as follows.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that *Miyata* fails to make up for the deficiencies of *Ueda*. Thus, independent claim 4 is allowable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the deficiencies of *Ueda*. Thus, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ueda* in view of Inoue (JP 07-024579) (*Inoue*, hereinafter). Applicant traverses this rejection as follows.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that *Inoue* fails to make up for the deficiencies of *Ueda*. Thus, independent claim 2 is allowable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the deficiencies of *Ueda*. Thus, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies, but are also distinguishable over the prior art. Thus, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully

requested.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ueda* in view of *Miyata* and in further view of *Inoue*. Applicant traverses this rejection as follows.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 5, Applicant respectfully submits that *Miyata* and *Inoue* fail to make up for the deficiencies of *Ueda*. Thus, independent claim 5 is allowable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the deficiencies of *Ueda*. Thus, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ueda* in view of Nishi et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0004190 A1) (*Nishi*, hereinafter). Applicant traverses this rejection as follows.

Claim 6 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency, but is also distinguishable over the prior art. Thus, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ueda* in view of *Miyata* and in further view of Seki (JP 11-340129) (*Seki*, hereinafter). Applicant traverses this rejection as follows.

Claim 9 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency, but is also distinguishable over the prior art. Thus, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 12 is also distinguishable over the prior art, and thus is in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney/agent to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a

mutually satisfactory solution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 19, 2008

/Anthony J. Canning, Reg. #62,107/
Anthony J. Canning
Registration No. 62,107

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000